FEB 2 8 2005 S

PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to ection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 08/949,525 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL October 14, 1997 First Named Inventor **FORM** Michael J. Wiener Art Unit 2137 **Examiner Name** Michael J. Pyzocha (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number ENT970827-1 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC | 🗸 | Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final **Provisional Application** Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify **Terminal Disclaimer** Extension of Time Request below): -return postcard Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C. Signature Keebang Printed name Christopher J. Reckamp Date Reg. No. February 24, 2005 34,414 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature

Typed or printed name

Christine A. Wright

Date February 24, 2005

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the

amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS

ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.





## PATENT APPLICATION

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Serial No.

Michael J. Wiener et al.

08/949,525

Filing Date: October 14, 1997

Confirmation No.: 8206

Examiner:

Michael J. Pyzocha

Art Group: 2137

Our file no.

10500.97.8271

Docket No. ENT970827-1

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR PROVIDING UPDATED ENCRYPTION KEY PAIRS AND DIGITAL SIGNATURE KEY PAIRS IN A PUBLIC KEY SYSTEM

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Certificate of First Class Mailing
I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an
envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment,

envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria,

VA 22313-1450, on this date,

Date

Christine Wright

## **RESPONSE**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated November 24, 2004, Applicants respond as follows:

## <u>REMARKS</u>

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 1-8 and 14-30 are allowed and that claims 11-13 would be allowable if rewritten to include limitations from intervening claims.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald et al. in view of Schneier. It is alleged that the McDonald et al. article discloses all of the limitations of claim 9 except that the new encryption key pair is not computable from a previous